

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

New dependent claims

Applicants have added new dependent claims 100-104, 106-110, 112-116 which are related to the system, method and computer program product independent claims 1, 24 and 47 respectively. No new matter has been added by way of these new claims and support for the claims may be found in the specification as follows:

New claims 100, 106 and 112 are supported by page 11, paragraph 3; page 33 and figure 9. New claims 101, 107 and 113 are supported by page 11, paragraph 3 and figure 10. New claims 102, 108, 114 are supported by page s 23-24 of the description. New claims 103, 109 and 115 are supported by page 19, line 1 and figures 4a and 4b. New claims 104, 110 and 116 are supported by page 14, lines 19 to page 15, line 17 and figure 3.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Independent claims 1, 24 and 47 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(e) for lack of novelty over US 6,067,401 (Abecassis). Applicants have by way of this response amended independent claims 1, 24 and 47 to more clearly distinguish over the prior art.

Claims 1, 24 and 47 all relate to the creation of an output video production from an input video signal. In particular, claim 1 claims a system for performing the above mentioned task while claims 24 and 47 claim a computerized method and a computer program respectively. Since the three independent claims as amended only differ by claim category but not by the inventive concept embodied, we will discuss the differences between the amended claims and Abecassis only by referring to claim 1.

Claim 1 as amended recites a system for creating an output video production comprising means for obtaining at least one descriptor value for each of a plurality of segments of the input video signal and means for selecting at least two video segments using a selection rule and the descriptor values. Additionally, the system also includes

means for deriving a sequencing order in which to present the selected segments. The sequencing means using a sequencing rule and the descriptor values of the selected segments to derive the new sequence which has a different order from the sequence of the segments in the input video signal. No new matter has been added by the amendments to claim 21 and support for the amendments can be found on page 34, paragraphs 1 and 3.

By contrast, the system disclosed in Abecassis only performs selective playback, it does not change the sequencing order of the input frames in an input video. The system merely inserts transitional segments 322 to replace intermediate frames which have been or are edited out by the user (see col. 9, lines 32-48). This ensures so that there is a seamless transition between the remaining selected frames even though certain intermediate frames have been edited out. The order of the selected frames remains the same as that in the original input video. Col. 7, lines 52-56 and col. 5, lines 42-56 clearly demonstrates that a change in the sequencing order of the selected video frames is not suggested by Abecassis as it states that the system disclosed in the application is concerned with optional forms of express of the same storyline *e.g.* of a movie. That is, depending on the frames which have been edited out, “PG”, “R” etc. versions of the same storyline is obtained. Therefore, since a change in the sequencing order would clearly result in a change of storyline, modifying Abecassis to provide a means for deriving a sequencing order defined in claim 1 would be going against its teachings. In view of this, we respectfully submit that claim 1 as amended as well as its rejected dependent claims 2, 9, 15-16, 19-20 are all novel and inventive over Abecassis. The same applies to independent claims 24 and 47 and its dependent claims since they recite “deriving a sequencing order in which to present the at least two selected segments, the new sequence being different from the sequence of the segments in the input video signal”.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The examiner has also rejected claims 3-8, 10, 22, 26-31, 33, 45, 49-54, 56 and 68 for lack of inventive step over Abecassis. As previously discussed, Abecassis fails

to teach or suggest “means for using a sequencing rule and descriptor values to derive a sequencing order in which to present the at least two selected segments, the new sequence being different from the sequence of the segments in the input video signal”.

As for the remaining prior art document UK Patent Application GB 2329812 (Sony) relied on by the examiner, it is not particularly relevant as it relates to an editing station which reconfigures the graphical user interface (GUI) according to the type of user. The editing of audio/video material is performed manually by the user and there is also no suggestion of a means for deriving a sequencing order in which to present the selected segments. Since neither Abecassis nor Sony alone or in combination disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 24 and 47, we submit that claims 3-8, 10, 21-23, 26-31, 33, 44-46, 49-54, 56 and 67-69 which are dependent on them are patentable over Abecassis and Sony and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection based on 35 USC § 103.

Claims 8, 31 and 54 have been amended to clarify that the descriptor values for each of the plurality of video segments is obtained by performing an automatic signal analysis of each segment and ascribing a value thereto based on the analysis. No new matter has been added by way of this amendment which is supported by page 16 to 17 of the description. The automatic signal analysis derivation of descriptors is not suggested by Abecassis who only talks about manually reviewing the contents of a program and manually assigning appropriate segment content descriptors. Since the remaining prior art Sony also does not suggest this feature, claims 8, 31 and 54 as amended are novel and inventive over both citations. Withdrawal of the rejection based on 35 USC § 103 is therefore respectfully requested.

New independent claims 105, 111 and 177

Applicants have by way of this response added new independent claims 105, 111 and 117 which relate to a system, method or computer program product including step 306 of segmenting of the input video material as shown in Figure 3. No new matter has been added by the inclusion of these new claims which are supported by page 23-24; page 29, last paragraph – page 30, lines 1-3 and Figure 5 of the description. Since the present species elected for examination is represented by the flowchart of Figure 3

and not by the features of independent claims 1, 24 and 47, we respectfully submit that the new claims are part of the elected species.

Again, since the newly added independent claims only differ by claim category but not by the inventive concept embodied, we will discuss the differences between them and Abecassis only by referring to claim 105. Claim 105 defines a system including means for using at least one time series descriptor to derive a set of segment boundary times which divide the input video signal into a plurality of segments. A further means provided in the system allows a user to apply a reduction rule to at least a second one of the time series descriptors so as to automatically obtain at least one segment descriptor for each segment of the input video signal, the or each segment descriptor having a single value for each video segment.

By contrast, Abecassis only discloses dividing the various scenes 302 of the input video program into appropriate segments 303 according to a manual evaluation (see col. 7, lines 28-38) of the contents of the scenes. The content Abecassis refers to is related to the storyline of the program such as violence, profanity, motion picture rating (see col. 9, lines 16-30 and Figure 3). There is no suggestion that the derivation of segment boundary times should be performed using time series descriptors or that the time series descriptors should be reduced to obtain segment descriptors which have single values for each segment of the input video (defined in claim 105). Since Abecassis neither discloses nor suggests the features of new independent claim 105, we submit that claim 105 as well as claims 111 and 117 which include the same inventive features are both novel and inventive over Abecassis.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Allen J. Hoover
Allen J. Hoover
Reg. No. 24,103

Wood, Phillips, Katz, Clark & Mortimer
500 West Madison Street – Suite 3800
Chicago, Illinois 60661-2511
Telephone: (312) 876-1800
Facsimile: (312) 876-2020
March 23, 2005